UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,437	05/05/2004	Howard Mark Garon		3436
	7590 06/23/200 NOLOGIES, INC.	EXAMINER		
3819 GLEN EA	GLES DRIVE	NGUYEN, KHAI MINH		
SILVER SPRIN	NG, MD 20906		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Applica	ion No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/709,4	137	GARON, HOWARD MARK				
Office Action Summary			er	Art Unit				
			NGUYEN	2617				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	on appears on ti	he cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IN THE MAILING IN THE MAILING IN THE MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicate operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF T CFR 1.136(a). In no e ion. period will apply and y statute, cause the ap	THIS COMMUNICATION Event, however, may a reply be tin will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from optication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	30 March 2009	9					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	-							
- /	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 								
Applicati	on Papers							
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary					
3) 🔲 Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	48)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claims 1-3 have been amended.

Zerphy in view of Baker clearly disclose at least one command monitor unit (see Zerphy, [0029] Network interface 510 communicates with **a remote computer** over a network) capable of connecting to the internet (see Zerphy, [0029] communicates (internet) with a item 510 of controller)

at least one internet server (see Baker, fig.1-2, item 4 (web site 4 includes the network interface 16 having an unique Internet address 18 and a **web server 30)**)

a controller interface (see Zerphy, item 510) also capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] lines 20-25), and

the object or device (see Zerphy, fig.1, items 102, 104, ...108) to be commanded and/or monitored ([0028]).

wherein the internet server (see Baker, fig.1-2, item 4 (web site 4 includes the network interface 16 having an unique Internet address 18 and a web server 30)) acts as the primary system controller (see Zerphy, fig.5, [0015]), handling commands and/or messages from the command monitor unit ([0029] The controller receives input from a user through the user interface 508 and/or network interface 510) and dispensing actions in the form of commands and/or messages to the object or device to be commanded and/or monitored (see Zerphy, [0030] for example, controller can

Application/Control Number: 10/709,437 Page 3

Art Unit: 2617

transmit three types of messages: a global message, a local message, and a communication integrity message. Global messages and local messages can be used to send data to each display unit and to instruct each display unit to update its display).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerphy et al. (U.S.Pub-20050156810) in view of Baker, Jr. (U.S.Pat-7058693).

Regarding claim 1, Zerphy teaches a method for the asynchronous and synchronous direct (wired) command and control of multiple and spatially disparate devices (fig.1) via the internet using single or multiple internet servers to facilitate that command and control (fig.5, [0029] item 510 communicates with a remote computer over a network. The network can be any data communications network including a combination of networks including the Internet), wherein the system constituents minimally comprise

at least one command monitor unit ([0029] Network interface 510 communicates with a remote computer over a network) capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] communicates (internet) with a item 510 of controller)

Art Unit: 2617

a controller interface (item 510) also capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] lines 20-25), and

the object or device (fig.1, items 102, 104, ...108) to be commanded and/or monitored ([0028]).

wherein the internet server (not show) acts as the primary system controller (fig.5, [0015]), handling commands and/or messages from the command monitor unit ([0029] The controller receives input from a user through the user interface 508 and/or network interface 510) and dispensing actions in the form of commands and/or messages to the object or device to be commanded and/or monitored ([0030] for example, controller can transmit three types of messages: a global message, a local message, and a communication integrity message. Global messages and local messages can be used to send data to each display unit and to instruct each display unit to update its display).

Zerphy fails to specifically disclose at least one internet server.

However, Baker teaches at least one internet server (fig.1-2, item 4 (web site 4 includes the network interface 16 having an unique Internet address 18 and a web server 30)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to having one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Baker to Zerphy to allow the user to edit programs controlling the operation of the controller system.

Regarding claim 2, Zerphy teaches a method for the asynchronous and synchronous wireless command and control of multiple and spatially disparate devices

Art Unit: 2617

(fig.1) via the internet using single or multiple internet servers to facilitate that command and control (fig.5, [0029] item 510 communicates with a remote computer over a network. The network can be any data communications network including a combination of networks including the Internet), wherein the system constituents minimally comprise

at least one command monitor unit ([0029] remote computer) capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] communicates (internet) with a item 510 of controller) a controller interface (item 510) also capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] lines 20-25), and

the object or device (fig.1, items 102, 104, ...108) to be commanded and/or monitored ([0028]).

wherein the internet server (not show) acts as the primary system controller (fig.5, [0015]), handling commands and/or messages from the command monitor unit ([0029] The controller receives input from a user through the user interface 508 and/or network interface 510) and dispensing actions in the form of commands and/or messages to the object or device to be commanded and/or monitored ([0030] for example, controller can transmit three types of messages: a global message, a local message, and a communication integrity message. Global messages and local messages can be used to send data to each display unit and to instruct each display unit to update its display).

Zerphy fails to specifically disclose at least one internet server.

Art Unit: 2617

However, Baker teaches at least one internet server (fig.1-2, item 4 (web site 4 includes the network interface 16 having an unique Internet address 18 and a web server 30)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to having one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Baker to Zerphy to allow the user to edit programs controlling the operation of the controller system.

Regarding claim 3, Zerphy teaches a method for optimizing the forward and reverse communications paths, modalities and protocols between internet server and target device (fig.5, [0029] item 510 communicates with a remote computer over a network. The network can be any data communications network including a combination of networks including the Internet, corporate intranets), wherein the system constituents minimally comprise

at least one command monitor unit ([0029] remote computer) capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] communicates (internet) with a item 510 of controller) a controller interface (item 510) also capable of connecting to the internet ([0029] lines 20-25), and

the object or device (fig.1, items 102, 104, ...108) to be commanded and/or monitored ([0028]).

wherein the internet server (not show) acts as the primary system controller (fig.5, [0015]), handling commands and/or messages from the command monitor unit ([0029] The controller receives input from a user through the user interface 508 and/or network interface 510) and dispensing actions in the form of commands and/or

messages to the object or device to be commanded and/or monitored ([0030] for example, controller can transmit three types of messages: a global message, a local message, and a communication integrity message. Global messages and local messages can be used to send data to each display unit and to instruct each display unit to update its display).

Zerphy fails to specifically disclose at least one internet server.

However, Baker teaches at least one internet server (fig.1-2, item 4 (web site 4 includes the network interface 16 having an unique Internet address 18 and a web server 30)).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to having one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Baker to Zerphy to allow the user to edit programs controlling the operation of the controller system.

4. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Zerphy et al. (U.S.Pub-20050156810), in view of Baker, Jr. (U.S.Pat-7058693), and Background of the invention.

Regarding claim 4, Zerphy and Baker further teach a method as in any one of claims 1, 2, and 3, in which the command and control (see Zerphy, fig.1) of Dynamic Message Signs (DMS) (see Zerphy, [0010]), Changeable Message Signs (CMS) and Variable Message Signs (VMS) (not show), either fixed, portable or mobile may be realized (Baker, item 8).

Zerphy and Baker fail to specifically disclose Changeable Message Signs (CMS) and Variable Message Signs (VMS).

However, Background of the invention teaches Changeable Message Signs (CMS) and Variable Message Signs (VMS) ([0003]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to having one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Background of the invention to Zerphy and Baker to allow the user to command and control and reduce the cost of system.

Regarding claim 5 is rejected with the same reasons set forth in claim 4.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/709,437 Page 9

Art Unit: 2617

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHAI M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-7923. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent P. Harper can be reached on 571.272.7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VINCENT P. HARPER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/Khai M Nguyen/ Examiner, Art Unit 2617

6/15/2009